ISGP'S SOCIALIST-IMPERIALIST PARTY: UP THE WHITE BIRTH RATE, DEPORT THIRD WORLD IMMIGRANTS, SPLIT WORLD CONTROL WITH FAR EAST ASIANS AND INTEGRATE WITH THEM

By: Joël van der Reijden | **Date:** October 9, 2015 | **Updated:** July 28, 2025.

CONTENTS

1. Intro: If the ISGP Party was in power

2. Point-summary of positions

3. Labor unions and the concept of socialism
4. Reining in superclass influence over the democratic processes
5. Media access of political candidates
6. House prices
7. Healthcare: Eastern and Western medicine
8. LGBTQ: Gay and tranny rights
9. Drugs vs psychedelics and plant medicine
10. Energy policy: alternative energy, Moon mining, minerals
11. Sustainable development: CO_2, sea levels, overpopulation, turning deserts green
12. European integration: military, Vatican, Belgium, language barriers
13. Russia and China
14. Third World immigration: crime and Muslim extremism
15. All Palestinians of Israel to Lebanon
16. Education
17. Zero-tolerance city districts
18. Dog ownership
19. Gun laws: E.U. and U.S.
20. Prostitution

21. Notes

"I just discovered your site which is fascinating, and we ought to talk one day. It so happens that I have personally met some of the people you mention on your site, or their close collaborators. ... My father was known in history as probably the biggest supporter of world government ... You may not agree that what I do is a solution, but I enjoin you to ... look for one."

~ **Advice from a think tank president who cooperates with CIA/State Department front groups Freedom House, the National Endowment for Democracy, the International Rescue Committee, George Soros' Open Society Institute and various other groups in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and South America. (Jan. 2008)**

Intro: If the ISGP Party was in power

As the quote above makes clear, a number of ISGP readers have wondered what kind of improvements can be made to the present political system in order to prevent the kind of conspiracies described on this website from happening in the future.

It took a few years, but what follows here is a list proposals and personal political viewpoints that might just achieve that. Some of these points should bring a lot of improvement to the democratic process once implemented. Other ideas are about more minor issues. The issue of upping white birth rates has actually been implemented by at least two East-European leaders since first being described on ISGP (I couldn't find anyone else talking about it at the time): Viktor Orban and Vladimir Putin. ISGP shares little to nothing else with these leaders, in the same way that the ISGP Party only shares portions with Green, Labor and Socialist parties in the West. If anything, it integrates them all.

The "ISGP Party" is super-liberal and quite socialist except with one thing: Third World immigration (a political combination that "mysteriously" doesn't exist in the West). If we allow immigration to continue from these areas, there's no point anymore to struggle for a liberal-socialist society, because the enormous crime numbers, religious extremism, genetic IQ issues, cultural regression and division will overwhelm western police forces, social security and healthcare networks, and bring western society, or what's left of it, to a grinding halt. Western society may even descent into tribal, sectarian warfare.

To make my point a little bit clearer: nothing I write here matters anymore if Third World immigration isn't brought under control and the native birth rate, which has dropped to a completely unsustainable 1.2-1.4, isn't upped to 2-2.5. In fact, it's becoming hard to see the point of

producing any additional ISGP articles. The whole idea has been to create a higher quality western civilization by helping to reduce establishment corruption. Collapsing native birth rates and ever increasing Third World immigration have turned that ideal into a pipe dream. Maybe that's one more reason, apart from cheap labor in an ever expanding economy, why elites love it so much. Let's not forget here that easily 70-80% of whites in western society already are strongly opposed to additional Third World immigration; it's just the Bilderberg and Trilateral Commission elites in western society that continue to push this agenda.

My experience is that people find deep conspiracy a lot more exciting than solutions, but it doesn't hurt to have an article/oversight like this up on ISGP to balance things out a little. Basically, if I was chairman of the ISGP Party and elected president or prime minister, I would push for and implement the following policies, both overtly or covertly.

Point summary of positions

Basic domestic policy

1. Protect the environment and European liberal-socialism with regard to social security, labor laws, housing and taxation.

2. Have that global minimum 15% tax for corporations implemented, even by force. Hopefully see it upped. If there's even one tax haven, enormous amounts of corporations will try to move there. Dodging taxes is only human nature and basic survival.

3. Restraining foundation and corporate "philanthropy", both on the "liberal CIA" and "conservative CIA" end.

4. Force up the white birth rate, one way or another, to at least 2.1.

5. Reversing immigration, as talked about below, will drive down house prices, which need to be *very* affordable. Low prices means people can quickly move wherever they want. Maybe force 1-2% of houses to be empty at all points, forcing home owners to make their houses more attractive to potential renters/buyers. Temporary housing contracts should be banned (again) and rent should not be allowed to be increased above annual inflation.

6. Force much more involvement of the media and the public into countering corporate scamming and cartel-forming. As an example, in the Netherlands, I have always been shocked at the prices at home improvement stores as Gamma and Praxis. I literally buy

nothing there unless I absolutely have too, and almost every time I do, I feel massively robbed. It also usually is pretty darn quiet. Turns out, all these home improvement stores are scamming their customers.

Here's an example of a steel shelf bracket I had to buy 20 of in June 2025. I bought them at the local Action, rather uniquely focused on making items available at low prices with high sales numbers: 1 euro a piece. Curious, I checked the price when visiting the local (always massive) Praxis hardware stores: 8.79 a piece for the EXACT same shelf bracket. Same price at the similarly massive Gamma. So 20 x 8.79 = 176 euros. At the Action I spent 19.95. Praxis and Gamma should be buying at least similar quantities, and would be selling way more at the lower one-eight price, so it's pretty shocking the things we allow:

7. Build modern, well-insulated, flora-filled, luxerious skyscrapers in places where space for forests and wildlife is limited, such as the Netherlands.

8. Force audio and video into the courts, and the release of full transcripts, as judges, prosecutors and lawyers here in the Netherlands are completely and totally corrupt. They can just band together and do whatever they please as it is very hard to prove any manipulations due to the mentioned restrictions.

9. Efficiency everywhere in the medical field. For example, ban the few hundred orthodontists in the country from making 14,000 euros a month, forcing the entire population to pay itself blue for braces for their children. Allow a higher quota and limit the income.

10. Probably move towards a 6-7 hr work day where feasible to stimulate well-being, family life, art, etc. Apparently various studies show shorter working days lead to higher productivity.

11. Make educations shorter, less theoretical and more practical. Less focus on degrees, as they feed egos and create barriers, and more on competence. Make it easier for people to pick up an education in their 30s, 40s and 50s.

12. Stimulate technological thinking in (otherwise dysfunctional) men from an early age, which usually means exposing them to dangerous toys and allow them to tweak and tune just about anything about it.

13. Legalized early stage abortion is fine. Much more important though is that young, single mothers are able to rent or even buy (very) affordable houses while maybe even also doing an education at the side

14. A toleration of LGBTQ and feminism, without the extremist propagandist elements. Differences and similarities between men and women should be properly investigated and acknowledged. Toleration of these elements will go only as far as long as they don't interfere with the birthrate.

Basic foreign policy

15. A moderately imperialist agenda towards the Third World, not in the financial interest of a tiny handful of multinationals influencing the government (oil companies being the the classic example), but in the interest of the western population as a whole: access to resources at reasonable prices and hopefully giving a sense of stability to the Third World.

16. The use of political assassination and, if needed, tactical nuclear weapons (to prevent trillion-dollar invasions and air campaigns)

against any Third World country in even a beginning stage of creating weapons of mass destruction. The planet is at stake.

17. As this author has been saying since before anyone had heard of SpaceX: mine the moon, Mars and asteroids. Instead of spending trillions in pointless wars in the Middle East, we should already been doing that since the 2000s, well before the Asians could have catched up.

Immigration and family, national and international

18. Immediate scrapping of all "anti-racism" / "everybody is equal" laws, as they are suffocating and terrorizing the white population in particular. You can still prosecute people along these lines for "verbal abuse"/"assault"/"stalking" if A) the verbal attack is primarily emotional; B) there's no context for it; C) the assaulter refuses to stop after so-called "stop signals" have been provided.

19. With the additional tax revenue of a global 15% tax rate, increase the native white birth rate and hence family structure.

20. Don't let non-white immigrant groups outbreed native whites. Bring the total number of immigrants down to 5% or so and start race mixing from there in a controlled fashion.

21. Move most race mixing to Africa to up the consciousness of that continent and hopefully prevent it in that manner from killing all the wildlife, sealife and jungles.

22. A legitimate appraisal of the value of aid work to Africa, as the continent's birthrates, even after so many decades of aid, are still completely unsustainable and literally drowning out the white, Jewish, Arab and Asian races in particular. When western elites talk about unsustainable birth rates, they are literally talking about "African birth rates".

23. Base the quota per immigrant group on historic and present ethnic crime and IQ numbers, as well as cultural compatibility. Arguably ethnicities with even 3 times the heavy crime numbers shouldn't be allowed at all except on a highly controlled basis (with some of them known to have 5-30x more): sports, vacation, music, work permits, a clean record, well-behaving.

24. Deport all the most criminal immigrants. Then the most dysfunctional. Then everybody who remains a problem. Do this too

for all second, third, fourth, etc. generations, unless they are at least 75% white. Living in the West should be a privilige, not a right.

25. Mixed-race kids not at least 75% white go back with the immigrant father/mother/parents when they are deported. Any white parent is free to tag along.

26. Citizen militias along the West's borders to apprehend illegal immigrants.

27. Military force and coups against any country that doesn't stop illegal immigrants from trying to get onto western shores.

28. A discussion whether we should legalize (large) rifles, too big to carry around, for self defense in and around the home and at work - but only to low crime ethnicities as white people, Far East Asians and Jews. This to protect themselves from high crime ethnicities.

29. For both white population expansion and race mixing, think of Eastern Europe, nearly empty Russia, upper Central Asia and the Far East. Global warming, technological progress in long-distance travel and nuclear fusion should make these areas much easier and more enjoyable to live in the near future.

Labor unions and the concept of socialism

The following section is many years old. The positions are still the same, except that the author has recognized that perpetual economic growth is very much desired to motivate people to set up their businesses and try to grow them ever bigger. With a stagnating population that is very tough to do.

- Relatively strong labor unions is a basic human right. Without labor unions we have fascism / corporatism. Labor unions that are too strong cause anarchism / communism.

- A removal of the stigma on the term "socialism". Basic, moderate socialism is simply about communication between employees and employers. It is for a minimum wage, a maximum number of working hours, the abolishment of child labor, having a pension, and watchdog agencies for banks and corporations. This is what FDR's New Deal of the 1930s was about--and the fact that this program is still absolutely loathed among especially wealthy

conservatives should tell people something. Whoever has the money, controls the state. Remove socialism and a cycle starts in which the strong will appoint their friends and family members to power and corrupt the entire state. If you are born poor, no matter what your potential, you will stay poor.

- Pro-social security, but not to the point it makes people too comfortable. Just cover the absolute basics for the small percentage of citizens (about 1 in 20 of working class age in white societies) who aren't able to help themselves for whatever reason. Who would want to live in a family or tribe that allows members who have short-term or long-term mental or physical issues, or other setbacks, to starve to death? I don't. And I don't prefer to live in a civilization or society that does. Besides, beggars in the street make everyone depressed.

  It's important to note, that in a society not ravaged by Third World immigration, which is to be discussed in a separate article, these programs work just fine.

- Relatively easy access to education at any age and with any income. Certainly multiple nationally recognized high school exams a year (there are different levels of this in some countries) that allow people quick access to college educations. Scrap high school courses that are only recognized by a specific college or university. They benefit no one except the institute that offers them.

Reining in superclass influence over the democratic processes

- Pressure ALL offshore tax havens to give up their banking secrets, because they house untold billions of the wealthy classes and criminal syndicates that should either be taxed or eliminated. If

everyone pays his dues, cheap medicare and other important government programs shouldn't be any problem in the West, even the United States. If these tax havens can't survive without their questionable industry, propose to let them integrate with neighboring countries. Offshore havens tend to be tiny countries or independent islands who share cultural traits and language with neighboring countries.

- While possibly not necessary when many of the other measures here are implemented, it might be an idea to limit the amount of wealth one person can possess to $1-1.5 billion and keep close watch on any loopholes that billionaires will undoubtedly come up with. Do give any persons with a $1-1.5 billion fortune considerable freedom in how their 100 percent taxed income is spent: a hospital in New York, a bridge over the Straits of Gibraltar, a new road in Texas, you name it. The wealthy love their foundations and charitable projects these days, so why should they worry about this measure when they have great freedom in how to spend their wealth?

  Capitalism is a wonderful tool, but maybe there should be limits here. This measure will only affect the tiniest portion of the public to the great benefit of the other 99.9999 percent of the population. We are increasingly looking at robber baron proportions when it comes to wealth inequality. The problem is not just in the United States, but also in Europe, where much of the wealth is tucked away in offshore bank accounts. Official statistics reveal that in 2011 the top 1% of the population owned 42.7% of all the wealth in the United States, the top 20% owned 93%, and the remaining 7% needed/needs to be shared by 80% of the population. The amount of billionaires increases all the time at the expense of all the rest. This is not a good development.



Keep in mind, there's more to getting rich than hard work and finding a unique service or product. The quickest way to the top is through friends and associates that are already made, which often means you have to compromise or cater to them. Even then they'll often exploit you, because of their more powerful position. And in a worst case scenario, as would be the case with ISGP, if the people at the top do not like your work, they have tremendous resources to keep you down at the bottom.

By the way, ordinary persons have NO say in how their tax dollars are spend. That's for the government they voted on to decide. Everybody loves to build hospitals and the like, but few prefer their money to be spend on social security, the military, road maintenance or state-appointed lawyers for defendants.

What might be important to mention is that it could be fruitful to create a wealth breakdown for the white population alone, or the white and black population combined, this because of massive Mestizo / Mexican immigration in recent decades and knowledge of their lower level of culture and genetic IQ compared to whites (and much higher crime numbers). Back in the early 1990s, 85% of the U.S. was still white; this will have dropped below 50% around 2045.

- As an extension to the above point, the trend towards billionaire philanthropy needs to be reined in. Sheldon Adelson, with an estimated fortune of $27 billion in 2015, made this problem abundently clear when he stated:

  > *"There are fewer philanthropists being grown and there are greater expectations of the government. I*

believe that people will come to their senses and not extend the current [Obama] administration's quest to socialize this country. It won't be a socialist democracy because it won't be a democracy." [1] [1]

In other words, Sheldon wants to keep all his money to himself and only spend a small portion of it on projects that personally benefit or pleasure him, or provide him with prestige. This simply is not how things should work. Billionaires should give their money to the democratically-elected government, just as all other citizens. Then this democratically-elected government decides how to spend their money: roads, schools, medicare, pensions, etc. If people don't like how money is being spent, they vote for a different candidate four years down the line.

What we have today is that billionaires, especially those allied with the Rockefeller clique, have put a large portion of their fortunes in tax-free foundations and literally using the money to infiltrate, subvert and manipultae society at every level. Looking at it objectively, for them, philanthropy is a perfect way to create a ruling class that decides which think tanks, universities, and independent science projects will and will not be funded. They:

- get tons of prestige to feed off;
- can draw additional media attention to their enterprises;
- are able to network through charities and NGOs;
- are able to make important aspects of our society dependent on their money, and;
- can use their billions to manipulate society, as is especially evident with George Soros, Rockefeller, Bronfman, and Bill Gates funds linked to groups as Occupy Wall Street [2], the psychedelics movement [3], Black Lives Matter [4], and pro-West Eastern European independence groups [5].

Today even things as space exploration for minerals or deep space research projects are increasingly dependent on the "generosity" of billionaires. Instead, a lot of this money should end up in the government's treasury, assuming, of course, that additional measures have been taken to ensure a more democratic process is in place than is the case today.

- Make it illegal for senior government officials to associate with their successors, except in official capacity and only with specialized television and radio channels available that record the entire conversation. A few national security exceptions can be made for the (elected) president, who is supposed to know every

secret of the nation. Former administration officials are not allowed to meet at corporate boards, foundations, think tanks or private conferences together. The reason for these measures is obvious: this is a large part of how old boy networks work and how they maintain influence over later governments. If persons are unwilling to make this small sacrifice, they shouldn't run for high office.

In addition, a small specialized government agency should be instated that monitors connections between leading former government officials and any subordinates. Any ties found or any exceptions granted will be made public instantly, with newspapers keeping a watchful eye on this agency.

Media access of political candidates

"If you're not careful, the newspapers will have you hating the people who are being oppressed, and loving the people who are doing the oppressing."

~ Malcolm X.

- Change can only come when electoral candidates have guaranteed, unbiased access to the media. A system is needed that protects journalists and television crews from the mafia, big business, the judiciary, the intelligence services, and the executive office, while at the same time promoting journalistic responsibility and accountability. This is a highly complex subject for which I haven't done enough thinking yet to come up with solid solutions. A few ideas:

  - Don't abolish any existing media. Rein in the paparazzi a bit though and the bullying and intimidation tactics of certain Fox News hosts. Seeing a show of Bill O'Reilly is like watching a broadcast straight from Nazi Germany.

  - Greatly diversify media ownership, which for the vast majority is owned by a handful of multinationals as General Motors and Bertelsmann. The public, both individuals and small businesses, should come to own a large percentage of the shares. I'll leave it in the middle which percentage would be ideal.

  - Treat the media as a completely unique aspect of society. Investigative journalism should become a sort of civic duty with great input from the masses.

- Include a basic investigative journalism course in pre-school, high school and college education programs. Take out any degree of elitism. Every citizen should be able to conduct research and write articles.

- Money incentives will have to be taken out. Every citizen pays a to-be-determined sum a year that goes into a specific fund that allows several news agencies to operate.

- To prevent stagnation, nepotism and infiltration by intelligence agencies, there needs to be a lot of forced rotation in news anchors, journalists and executives. Maybe it's not a bad idea to create a national database with millions of people willing to serve one or two years in one of these positions.

- Full backgrounds need to be available to the public for every person selected in order check for any anomalies. Full disclosure on any prominent historic friends and acquaintances is mandatory.

- All newspaper databases (Lexis Nexis, Proquest, Who's Who, etc.) should be available to the public for a small fee, certainly all newspaper articles older than, let's say, 5 years. For years I've had free unlimited access to these databases and they make a huge difference research-wise, even more today with Google clogged up with thousands of bogus national security conspiracy sites. Now only university professors (and often students who have no time to research) and mainstream media reporters have access to these databases; outsiders have to pay exorbitant amounts of money. A project should be started to pool all these resources, largely already accomplished by universities, and offer them to the public at large for an acceptable fee, maybe even free.

House prices

- The mortgage payments or rent the average individual pays for his or her house each month should be maintained around 20% of his or her monthly income, and ideally even a little lower. That leaves enough room for people to pay for a car, insurance, food, clothing and save a little on the side for hard times, an education, a night

out, or a vacation. Thus if the situation approaches 25% prices should be forced down under all circumstances. If this fails, we need massive protests and investigative committees..

To illustrate, from at least the 1970s house prices in the Netherlands have outstripped the combined effects of inflation and wage rising at least four times. There were serious problems in the 2000s with starters, looking to live by themselves, with finding affordable housing. Since then, the situation has gotten exponentially worse, with even university-educated starters not being able to afford anything by themselves anymore.


AVERAGE HOUSE PRICES IN THE NETHERLANDS - HIGHER THAN ANTICIPATED IN 2019
White birth rate in western Europe 1.2-1.4 by the 1980s, so every year more and more empty houses without immigration. Not taken into account is the slightly higher birthrates among immigrants, which add many more additional immigrant numbers each year, upping it to a total of about 1.7 anno 2022.
July 2022: €448,000
2021: €387,000
Historische stijging huizenprijs
Werkelijke prijs
Gemiddelde stijging
2008
Gemiddelde koopsom in 2008: € 254.918
2015
1959-83: no. of "guest workers": Turkey, Morocco, Spain, Italy.
Gemiddelde koopsom in 1978: € 90.212
2015-20: 73k immigrants: 17k East Block, minus Russia. 45k non-West: Syria, Eritrea, Iran, Iraq, Antilles, Morocco, Turkey.
€ 500.000
€ 450.000
€ 400.000
€ 350.000
€ 300.000
€ 250.000
€ 200.000
€ 150.000
€ 100.000
€ 50.000
€ 0
1950
1960
1970
1980
1990
2000
2010
2020

2019 graph with added information until 2022, as well as some rough (but accurate) notes detailing the effects of immigration on house prices, a forbidden subject to talk about in the media.

The rent of homes has seen a similar trend. Even the social rent market is completely paralyzed with grown unmarried men and women increasingly having to bunk together in order to be able to afford anything. The only thing the government of (frequent Bilderberger) Mark Rutte has done is come up with "solutions" that only benefit neoliberals and immigration: introducing temporary rental contracts and bullying "scheefwoners" ("crooked tenants": those who rent relatively cheap due to their income) out of cheap houses with extra high rent increases to make room for new waves of poor Third World immigrants. It's the most obvious scam ever, but never talked about in the media.

It's a similar situation in other European countries, from Sweden to England. In England the average person spent 17.5% on his or her mortgage in 1996 compared to 49.5% in 2008, the numbers

for London being even worse.



One problem with this issue is that seldom enough data is made available to the public. People have to crawl through and put together all the numbers themselves. The above graphs are rare and even they do not provide a complete picture.

Healthcare: Eastern and Western medicine

- Ban fluoride from the drinking water worldwide. It's one of the worst poisons ever. Just because fluoride hardens the enamel when it is topically applied onto the teeth, doesn't mean we should have it in the rest of our body. So much is clear from Dutch toothpaste tubes: these days they always come with warnings to never swallow the toothpaste, even in very small amounts.

  Despite a few early discussions, the Netherlands never allowed fluoride in the water for exactly this reason: it's an extreme poison. Mainland Europe (except Spain) also doesn't have fluoride in the water. It's a typical problem associated with the English-speaking world: Great Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Also Argentina, Chile and a few other Third World countries have it in the water. Why they don't remove it? I have no clue.

- Ban chlorine additives to the drinking water. For many years now in the Netherlands our watered is filtered with UV. You noticed the difference in taste immediately.

  The chlorine question reminds me: the worst drinking water I ever tasted (and I've tasted it in some backward European countries)

was in a hotel one block from the Capitol in Washington, D.C. The chlorine content was just massive. It even burned my eyes under the shower.

- Pro-medicare as it used to be in the Netherlands until 2002/2003: government-ran for less than 30 euros a month (for young, healthy people) with all the basics covered, including the dentist, and any major procedures. After social security was fully privatized--the "American model"--costs mysteriously tripled within a few years and continued to rise, with little being covered anymore. That's what they call corruption.

- Great focus on the development and integration of alternative medicine. Personal experience tells me that most diseases can be completely cured by correctly working with the meridian system *yourself*. Prevention is much easier though.

- In addition to the meridian system, many millions a year should be made available for the study of near death experiences, out of body experiences, past life regressions (and verifying them), the "in between state", and half a dozen other subjects in order to create a new, non-cultish, fact-based world religion that combines Darwinism and creationism. This is actually being attempted by the Rockefeller clique, seemingly under the Baha'i religion, but there's evidence for cultism and manipulation here. Just look at the average Coast to Coast AM guest.

LGBTQ: gay and tranny rights

This subject changed dramatically since first making these political stances available in terms of the amount of elite and "liberal CIA" propaganda: through the mainstream media, street activism and social media. They turned everything into a very complex freak show that only

functions to rip society apart on a pointless issue. Just typing the word "queer" in (Bilderberg and Trilateral Commission company) Google to find out what it means, and a page size animation loads of people of every ethnicity partying at a pride parade.

So, whereas before ISGP didn't consider LGBTQ a non-issue, with everybody being allowed to be gay, tranny, or whatever they please, ISGP now supports harsh measures against the "LGBTQ community", in no small part to keep family structures intact and boost birth rates. Even the classical desired scene of "hot girls kissing" is becoming problematic, because "hot girls kissing" don't produce babies and maybe should be allowed to raise kids. So what follows is the usual hybrid thought between conservative and liberal elite/CIA.

- To summarize ISGP's position: LGBTQ deviancy is tolerated, not stimulated. And if tolerance leads to stimulation, we may have to revise our tolerance.

  In this, "deviancy" is not meant negatively. LGBTQ is mainly seen as fun little "deviant" behavioral experiment that should not come at the expense of birth rates and family structures. Gay people and trannies are fun right because - guess what - there are not many of them. Or it's just stupid stuff you do for a party. It's a fun little freakshow.

- A ban on multinationals and foundations being allowed to finance LGBTQ activim.

- Full public disclosure on multinationals and foundations that fund LGBTQ activism (or Third World immigration) with regard to their ties to political candidates.

- A reorganization of the media by banning multinationals and/or foundations to own any of it, and certainly not more than one outlet.

- Gay rights. Publicly-funded education towards making or keeping it acceptable. Homosexuality has been a common phenomenon throughout human history. These people aren't hurting anyone and have equal rights to be happy.

- Gay marriage? Fine, for now. If it turns out that this tolerance is creating more and more gay couples, that open-mindedness is

going to have to be reviewed.

- Married gay couples adopting children? Although there is likely to be a difference between two hot in-shape women and two fat depressed lesbo's with purple hair, children raised by gay couples are extremely susceptible to being bullied into oblivion, devoloping a skewed worldview and experiences due to the absence of a male or female role model, and at great risk of being indoctrinated along LGBTQ lines.

- Dressing kids below the age of 16 in dresses? Forbidden. Get caught two times: they go to foster parents. Between the ages of 16-18 potential complaints from kids about this are treated in the same manner.

  The same treatment is merited when parents force girls to have hair shorter than shoulder length and ban them from wearing dresses. Kids are allowed to file formal complaints about that.

  Chronically overweight kids below maybe the age of 16 arguably should also be placed in foster care relatively quick.

- A ban on gay marriage between (relatively young) female couples that are vastly overweight - the classical "dyke phenomenon". Both need to be government-tested for 5 years every few months at a BMI of 22 or so, or have a high degree of fat free mass (FFMI). They also need to have their hair at least reaching their shoulders during this period. Why? So they become sexually attractive to many different males. And it's nice little test of loyalty, making an eventual marriage extra-special.

  Implement the same for men if you will. They likely need that far less though.

- A biological male can never become a woman by law, and vice versa. They can only be formally labeled as "artificial female" or something along those lines. They become an in-between gender.

- "Artificial males" (women who became men) and "artificial females" can both participate in professional male sports leagues, although separate transsexual leagues are desired. If they die, for example in boxing, they die. "Artificial females" (men who became women) can only participate professionally in transsexual

leagues. If they hide their biological identity, they are prosecuted. A good punishment might be to box in a male league.

Drugs vs psychedelics and plant medicine

- Legalization and acceptance of ayahuasca, psychedelic mushrooms, and ibogaine. At the very least anyone in contact with the police or psychiatry should be given these very impressive natural medicines. In contrast to popular belief, these psychedelics can provide persons with tremendous creative and psychological insights, and have a tendency to confront people with their own unhealthy thoughts and actions. People really should have the freedom to experiment with psychedelics that are non-addictive and beneficial. Certain other psychedelics should potentially also be legalized. Possibly rules need to be put in place to prevent accidents caused by people high on psychedelics. Purified DMT should also be legalized. Especially intravenously injected DMT seems to have incredible healing potential.

- Legalization of cannabis/weed, but only on doctor's prescription - as there are indications it is not great for brain development. And if it has been prescribed to you, it should be illegal to smoke at work, in public places (except in remoter areas), or any place where the stench becomes a nuisance to others. I personally have never smoked weed, by the way. Did eat it once, but it's not my thing.

- Production of hemp should be legalized and promoted, as it is an ideal plant to produce fuel, food, clothing and other products from.

- The tobacco plant maybe should be legal, but all the dozens of cancerous and addictive additives in cigarettes should be banned instantly - as well as the plastic in the filters. These additives cause DNA mutations leading to very high numbers of lung cancer and other genetic diseases, which, of course, are passed on to future generations. In other words, it undermines civilization as a whole.

- Also with regard to hard drug policy: As discussed before, immigrants are not our problem. You either ship them out to the

Third World country or continent of origin, or you force them to clean up in a work camp and ship them over the border with the money they made. If they try to break out, either shoot them or ship them out instantly.

The author doesn't have statistics on drug use at the time, but from various videos immigrant groups do seem overrepresented. Also just watching a 2022 video on N2O use in the Netherlands, it quickly comes up that among those causing the worst problems are, *"You're not allowed to say, but a lot of people with foreign backgrounds."*[6]

- With the remaining white addicts you have to gauge how bad the problem still is and see what is economically feasible.

- Especially with the rise of fentanyl and tranq and major American cities overran by zombie-like drug addicts, countless of them committing crimes of theft, a practical but still zero-tolerance policy on hard drug use. Fentanyl, tranq, cocaine, crack, heroin, PCP (Angel Dust), crystal meth, designer drugs as 3MMC, and similar drugs all remain banned.

  "Zero tolerance" here means: arrest and forced treatment, with arrestants having to work - possibly in camps with a military regiment - to not be a financial and social burden on society.

- However, stuffing people into regular prisons for personal use of drugs is not going to be practical or moral though, except for people involved in theft and robberies. Someone who enjoys partying on ketamine or cocaine, you might let go a little bit the first few times. But it might be best to have special prisons and work camps for addicts.

- Ideally you destroy all availability. Build walls and use all high technology measures to prevent drugs from coming into the country. Money confiscated from drug cartels should not be burned, but used to finance the drug war, or at the very least for treatment programs. As for military operations, anything should go: infiltration, eavesdropping, disinformation to create internal rivalries, assassination, etc. But the war itself should largely pay for itself, if only to use cartels for experimental tactics and use of weaponry and related technology.

- Certainly once the Third World element is gone, you can always play with variations of legalizing drug use. However, full drug legalization is opposed by ISGP, because a lot of drugs these days are far too addictive and destructive to allow any non-user to be around. Dealers are literally going to purposely addict non-users to create bigger markets. Secondly, drug users tend to cause a lot of problems. If what they are doing is not criminal, or they can't be arrested for it, the problems they cause will become greater.

Energy policy: alternative energy, Moon mining, minerals

- A focus on sustainable development and alternative energy due to rapidly decreasing oil and gas reserves. Even shale oil is a temporary solution as the fracking process accompanying it seems to be highly polluting. Nuclear energy shouldn't be a problem in geologically stable areas (some day we can shoot the waste materials to the sun and luckily uranium is far from an unlimited resource). Revolutionary technologies to split water into hydrogen and oxygen, as well as cold fusion type devices as the E-Cat (see ISGP's intro article), should become part of the mainstream discourse. An open minded can-do attitude should prevail and people should be stimulated to create home-made devices. This will increase interest in science and engineering and lead to more discoveries.

- We should have already been on the Moon to control or certainly compete in future helium 3 nuclear fuel mining. At the moment, China is leading the race and with a basically unlimited supply of helium 3 it would also be able to greatly expand its economy and population. Quite possibly we need to work hard on alternatives and ban helium 3 from being used on Earth, because it allows for the manufacturing of super-heavy nuclear bombs (75 megatons or so) that do not pollute the environment with radiation.

- Realpolitik should become part of the public discourse. We need the resources from Third World countries and make sure we continue to get them. The only alternative is that western society collapses and we can all go back to tribal warfare. In turn, however, western societies should do whatever they can to work on scientific breakthroughs in every area of sustainable development. It should also actively become engaged in reducing the world's population through birth control measures.

Sustainable development: CO2, sea levels, overpopulation, turning deserts green

- The rise in global CO2 levels is worrying to say the least. Over the past several thousand years, which already constitutes one of the warmest periods ever on Earth, we've had an average of 280 parts per million of CO2 in the atmosphere. This number began to rise rapidly with the Industrial Revolution around 1850. By 1960 we were at 320 ppm - 15% higher - and now in 2016 we've exceeded 400 ppm (43% higher). It is possible to debate to what extent CO2 will be able to increase global temperatures, as in the past CO2 levels always lagged behind global temperature changes - CO2 wasn't the cause. However, the rise of CO2 levels should be of considerable concern - it's a greenhouse gas, after all - and is one more reason to push for the introduction of green energy and possibly new revolutionary energy devices.



- I have to say, the global warming impact of methane is a tough nut to crack. Some estimates place it around 20% of the total impact, with CO2 being held accountable for 80%. At least one more recent report places methane at 51% of the total. At this point there seems to be an agenda to only deal with CO2 and probably, if the CO2 problem is under control, to then start talking about methane. However, just looking at the above graph it should be clear that the levels of methane are rising much faster than CO2. It's definitely something that should be given attention to.

  The problem with methane is that it is largely caused by the bio-industry/meat industry and if methane is truly that much of a

problem we'd probably have to ban meat and dairy to stave off catastrophic warming of the earth. No meat? Damn. I absolutely feel for the cows (chickens and pigs are less essential to me), but that's not a prospect I'm looking forward to. We definitely have to stabilize the world population and start colonizing the Moon and Mars so we can move part of our population over there.

- Equally worrying is that global sea levels continue to rise since the last ice age. Since that time they have risen a whopping 130 meters / 430 feet and could rise, if all the ice melts on earth, with another 60 meters / 200 feet. It appears that there's an increase in the annual sea level rise over the 20th and 21st century from about 1.8 mm to about 2.5 mm, which, looking at the graph below seems to be well above the average of the past 7,000 years. Whether this is due to global warming or not (in the long run it certainly is), we should absolutely stop this rise. At the current rate we're looking at sea levels that are more than 18 cm / 7 inches higher in 2,100 than they are today. We will have to start evacuating certain coastal and island cities at that point.



The following graph, by the way, also provides us with a persuasive reason to start influencing the climate on planet earth, because few people would enjoy living on a huge ball of ice. Often global warming skeptics argue that this graph proves that there's no global warming, but they forget to point out that the amount of CO2 in the air has increased by 50% over just the past 170 years, which is different from any other time in the past.



- Cooperation with primarily China and India in promoting responsible birth control measures in the western world. With a world population at just over 7 billion, China and India have a combined population of almost 3 billion. Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam and Nigeria add another billion people and all have major, major overpopulation problems. The population in this part of the world will probably have doubled by 2060 or so, which is likely to devastate life standards and the environment even more.

  Poverty in these countries also affects us over here, because corporations move overseas to benefit from slave labor wages. And not just that: liberal western elites have embraced the "brilliant" idea of inviting the Third World here as "refugees" to offset our own birth rates, which western governments have allowed to fall too rapidly ever since the same elites developed and promoted the pill, condoms, abortion rights and the whole Planned Parenthood agenda.

  If you can't tell, in the large picture, you're looking at a river, the Citarum in Indonesia.

  For the next several centuries the United Nations should advise all

world citizens to only take 1 or 2 children. The West needs 3 children for the next several decades to offset its aging populations. Countries as China and India should stick to 1 or 2, but not make the same mistake as the West of forcing birth rates down too strongly too fast. Also, women rapidly need to become equal to men in these Far Eastern societies to prevent child murders. This is absolutely essential.

Africa should not be allowed to develop into economic powerhouses by the West and East without first fully stabalizing its population growth. This does not mean that Africa shouldn't receive aid in the form of preventing the worst hunger and war excesses - but only as long as the West can genuinely afford it. Ultimately it's up to the people of that continent to help themselves. If they dramatically lower their birth rates, eventually there should be enough food and space for everyone.

The West and East shouldn't allow the Middle East to develop into an economic powerhouse either, until it has overcome not just population growth, but also religious extremism and the extreme suppression of women.

Worldwide we need re-education programs that instill a sense of responsibility for the planet in all humans.

- The West and East should take the lead in protecting the rainforests in Latin America, Africa and Asia through military measures. Sooner or later it's going to be necessary, so better start now with what essentially comes down to pressuring governments in question to get a handle on their population growth and industrial development.

- At the present state of technology and known limits to natural resources, a world population of 1 billion people, maybe even a little less, would be preferable. At this point three billion people live in abject poverty and natural resources are being depleted at a very alarming rate. Ideally, and also in the long run (centuries), that people who chose to do so, should be able to go out in nature, gather edible nuts and plants, and maybe hunt wildlife. Ideally everyone knows how to build a basic wood cabin and live off the land when times get rough. We deserve it, the animals deserve it and the planet deserves it. No more non-biological bio-industry, no more nuclear accidents, a Great Pacific Garbage Patch, third world ghettos without sewer systems, homeless people, forced 8 to 16 hour working days, etc. Humans were meant to be part of

nature. Technology is essential, however, for luxury, entertainment and keeping everyone connected all over the planet. Fundamentally it should not change much in our modern western society, because this is primarily a third world problem. But a moderate reduction of our population will lead to happier and healthier people. Access to nature is essential in that. As long as everyone has access to biological food (including biological versions of pizzas, bread and hamburgers), large cities can continue to exist as they exist today. When the state of technology increases in terms of energy generation and access to minerals (from outer space), the amount of people on earth can increase.

To be honest, I think worldwide population reduction is hopelessly impractical. It's probably best for the West to largely stop and even reverse Third World immigration, weed out all high level political corruption, build a strong economy as a result, work hard on keeping a major technological edge over the Second (former communist) and Third World and deny countries that won't limit their population growth to the world's or even the solar system's resources. We can't take care of the whole world. We will have to lead by example and have the whole world join us.

- Like the artificial Yatir Forest in Israel, deserts should be turned into fertile land, especially the giant Sahara desert. However, it is very much preferable to have a grip on population growth first.

European integration: military, Vatican, Belgium, language barriers

- A military that is designed along the needs of the United States and the rest of Europe. Maintaining a considerable technological edge over the rest of the world should be considered absolutely essential, especially when it comes to facing undemocratic countries. Strong, healthy economies stand at the base of this.

This immediately rules out Third World "nation building" by the U.S. and a small group of allies that literally always fails and has cost the U.S. billions upon billions of dollars since 9/11 alone. Without NATO support and really even without a large portion of UN countries not going along, these type of "humanitarian" adventures should not be undertaken. It is not healthy to try and help the world all by ourselves and it will only work against us economically and diplomatically. Look at how the "War on Terror" literally increased the terror threat in the West by thousands of times in a 15 year period.

- Vatican City should cease to be a sovereign state and be stripped of its diplomatic status. The Catholic Church should only have the right to exist as a non-government religious group. The problem with the church is that it has been abusing its power for the past 2,000 years and is a danger to both the democratic process and the evolution of modern society. It's also a danger to the world with its refusal to support any birth control measures.

- Continental and global integration along political and economic lines, but at a slower pace as long as high level corruption remains a major issue. Not too many poor countries should be allowed to join at once (too late for that it appears) and democracy should not be sacrificed. The European Parliament, for example, is very weak.

- There should be a referendum for Belgian whether or not it should split up in a Flanders and Walloon part. To prevent economic stagnation, especially for Walloon, ideally the Dutch-speaking Flanders becomes part of the Netherlands while French-speaking Walloon, with all its aristocrats, becomes part of France. Not only would it be good for the Belgians, but it's one less country to worry about when it comes to European integration. EU headquarters should move from Brussels to the Netherlands, because it can't be in any of the European "superpowers": England, Germany, or France. Besides, the Dutch are the best in mainland Europe at speaking English, which is ideal to prevent logistical problems.

- Austria, Switzerland, Luxembourg and Belgium should be the first countries in Europe to be liquidated. They can split up into the Netherlands, Germany, France and Italy, based on dominant language. Spain and Portugal need to develop a common language and merge. Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece, even Israel, all have

the potential to become the California and Miami of Europe. Great Britain should come to include all of Ireland. Obviously religious instigation (the Vatican) should be curbed and no one can be made to feel a second class citizen. Political integration can't be taken much further than this without all citizens of mainland Europe learning English as a fluent second language. It probably wouldn't be bad if the Netherlands and Denmark merge into Great Britain, if only for a proper "balance of power", but that's going to be a harder sell, despite relative compatibility between cultural values and Dutch and Danish students learning English from a young age. Also, with every EU citizen learning proper English, this is a step that might not be necessary at all.

- The situation with the United States and Canada is far less acutely needed. Here we have just two countries with largely the same language and culture occupying an area much bigger than all of Europe. If there's ever going to be a merger, the French language has to be banned from Canada and the United States needs to get a grip on its Christian extremism and runaway capitalism.

  The U.S. merger with Mexico is disastrous for its culture, however, but that falls under Third World immigration problems.

Russia and China

- Overthrow Putin and anyone trying to continue his legacy. Do what you can to increase political and economic ties with China. Get China to come on board to get rid of the North Korean regime. Nothing else to offer at this point.

Third World immigration: crime and Muslim extremism



- Start a massive and positive propaganda campaign in coordination with the Far East (to prevent friction) in upping the birth rate of western society to 2 to 3 children per native western mother until the graying of the population has been stabilized. The numbers are between 1.4 and 1.7 for the most part at this point, which quite literally is suicidal. If these numbers persist, theoretically the white and Asian races will die out. The present short-sighted elite-induced thinking to remedy this issue with African and Middle Eastern refugees, where there are places with birth rates of up to 7 chidlren per mother, is completely insane because your dealing with largely (tribal) cultures that have between 5 and over 30 times the crime rates, are dealing with religious extremism, or literally don't have the genetic IQ numbers to sustain western society.

  Obviously, just by saying this (out loud) I automatically I become the new Hitler. However, that thinking is the result of massive Bilderberg network-induced propaganda, spread through the mainstream media and even armies of internet trolls and controlled opposition news websites. Why do you think the vast majority of western people can be against Third World immigration yet the establishment keeps pooh-pooing it as "populism"? Why do you think the media never discusses Third WOrld immigrant crime numbers in a proper manner? Because we don't have free media. All of it is controlled, even the (irrational) right-wing of the spectrum.

- To bring the same message in other words: Ban all Third World immigration to Europe from coming inand give nothing more than temporary working permits. Instead, integrate the continent to

work more efficiently and advise native citizens to take more children (2 or 3) for the next few decades to solve the problem of aging populations while aggressively promoting population stabilization measures for the Third World. We should control population growth, but we also have to take it more slowly. Since World War II we have had greatly improved hygiene, food supplies, medical care and technological breakthroughs, combined with the development of the pill, condoms and abortion rights. All this has resulted in plummeted birth rates. However, things have gone too quickly and now we are left with the huge problem of aging population that liberal elites have been trying to fix with an "open borders" policy to the Middle East and Africa. This is absolutely and totally unacceptable. Natives have become a minority in their own cities across western Europe, with an enormous decline in cultural values and manners being the result. Every native citizen in contact with groups of immigrants is completely fed up with it (already since the 1990s), but mainly privately due to endless elite and government-sponsored propaganda through the mass media.

There's a reason why there are no (functional) democracies in Africa and the Middle East and why these cultures have been lagging behind the West in terms of development. We should treat people from these cultures with respect (which includes a hand off policy without a good portion of the United Nations supporting involvement), but not allow them to tell us how to live and organize our society. Statistics reveal crime numbers 2 to over 6 times higher among Muslim and black (sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean immigrants), especially when it comes to repeat offences and violent crime with lengthy prison sentences. In another example, 54% of Moroccan youths in the Netherlands have a criminal record before the age of 23, with 18% having been in convicted at least 5 times. A graph from the U.S., which doesn't mention Muslims/Arab but compares to E.U. immigration numbers - without the guns:



And for those that immediately suspect that prejudices and racism are the cause of black prison numbers, here's another statistic from a November 2011 publication of the Bureau for Justice Statistics, 'Homicide Trends in the United States, 1980-2008', pp. 11-13:



It has to be emphasized that black people are vastly overrepresented in crime statistics from African and Caribbean blacks in Europe to American blacks and Australia's Aboriginals. They also genetically have the lowest IQs on the planet (only when it comes to crystallized intelligence and fluid reasoning), which appears to be the cause to a very large degree of these crime numbers, as well as the fact that black people are extremely underrepresented in the tech industry (in contrast to Indians, Jews, whites and Asians) and, even more shockingly, have never won a Nobel Prize for science (in contrast to extremely overrepresented Jews, who have the highest average IQs in the world). All this information is massively suppressed by the liberal media and NGO network, which has been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into Black Lives Matter and promotes the view that blacks continue to be victimized by the white race (in fact, worldwide, because blacks also aren't popular in Brazil).



As an alternative to Third World immigration provide temporary

working visas (for a lifetime if necessary), provide full benefits, even allow family to come over to prevent large groups of foreign men without partner, but ban the concept of anchor babies and do allow citizenship unless it's under the absolute strictist regulations: perfect grasp of the language, at least a high school level of education comparable to western standards, native wife, mixed children and FULL 100 percent cultural integration in every possible way.



The long-term aim of Europe should be to get back down to less than 5% non-western immigration (Asian not taken into account). As our own birthrate increases, Third World citizens will be shipped home - certainly those without mixed offspring and even those who have gained citizenship as far back as the 1980s - with NATO countries using force against countries who refuse to allow

their own citizens back in. Top secret, massive domestic spy programs will be implemented to determine which portion of the immigrant population, from all layers of society, is most deserving to remain, i.e., the most well-behaving and most integrated.

Generally, everyone from the former Dutch colonies in the Caribbean will go back and we will have zero involvement with them anymore. If necessary, all Dutch people living in the former colonies will come back in return, considering that's the retaliation that is is to be expected, especially because over there they are of the same opinion that there are too many Dutch immigrants.

Boat refugees will not be accepted at all. They are forced back. Captains of these ships and other traffickers will get the death penalty. Force will immediately be used against immigrants who refuse to comply. Under virtually all circumstances political refugees will have to go to countries that have a similar culture.

Meanwhile, massive population stabilization projects will be implemented against Africa, to prevent its citizens from destroying what remains of the rainforests, the wildlife and the fish in the sea and taking the entire human race with them.



All Palestinians of Israel to Lebanon

- Having studied Lebanese history, it turns out that this is a state that has fallen apart due to relentless Shia and Sunni immigration over the 20th century. This is also the country were many Palestinians fled to in the 1940s and 1950s after various conflicts

with the Jews. Therefore, it only makes sense for Israel to ship all Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza Strip to Lebanon.

Giving the Palestinians Lebanon, ideally with the United Nations aiding the building of homes and relocation efforts, seems like a very moral and practical solution that almost all states would want to welcome. Considering the Lebanese Christian Maronites allowed themselves to be completely overwhelmed by Shiites and Sunni Muslims, Palestinian immigrants - who are Sunni - can even have access to the Mediterranean Sea. How they want to deal with the Shia, that is their problem.

The Christian Maronites in the West form a separate state in the West of the country and are likely doomed anyway, because they allowed the once non-existent Shia in the country to dominate the south-west of the country, the border area with Israel. This makes having a practical military and economic alliance with Israel that much harder. This issue too pales in contrast to the Palestinian situation in Irael at this point.

More background:

The one-state solution for Israel and the Palestinians is not possible. The second that happens and all Palestinian refugees and their descendants return, the Jews will come to live in a majority Arab state. At best they'll be second-rate citizens.

The two-state solution in which the Palestinians get the West Bank really is not ideal either, because Palestine shouldn't be allowed to grow in power. Certainly Israel will have to keep its walls up to prevent continuous suicide bombings on Israeli busses and restaurants - as was the case in the past. Because there exists a ton of pro-Palestine propaganda in the West, people should understand really well that the Iranian-backed Hamas group controls Palestine and that support for Muslim terrorism is extremely high among Palestinians. Apart from that, Israel is the only functioning, truly pro-West democracy in the Middle East. Arabs simply have never demonstrated to be able to keep a democracy together, even when it is handed to them on a silver platter. And a country like Saudi Arabia could turn on us any time and start developing nukes if there is a regime change.



One of the reasons why Westerners shouldn't feel too sorry for the Palestinians. Other statistics reveal that 90% supported attacks on U.S. troops in Iraq, 89% supports Sharia law, and 56% only maintains positive memories of Osama bin Laden, with another 22% having mixed positive and negative feelings. Jews and Palestinians will not live in peace together for another couple of centuries. Separate them, but give each a chance to build a viable state.

The third option, which has realistically been implemented by the United States over the past few decades, is one of overt balanced diplomacy with covert support for Israel's expansion of the settlements.

I personally support this policy too and would like to see a more active pursuit of the destruction of the Iran-Assad-Hezbollah-Hamas axis. There's no reasoning with the majority of Muslims. They have very high crime numbers, lower genetic IQ than the Jews, largely live in tribes that are in a continued state of opposition to one a another (not to mention the Shia-Sunni divide), and can't treat women with any decency. Compare that to Israel, where women have to serve in the military and have equal opportunities as men. It simply makes no sense to support the Arabs against Israel, at least covertly. And what if Israel gets overrun? That means another humanitarian crisis, because they all have to come to Europe and the West. That will cause friction. They need their own country.

Moving all Palestianians to Lebanon seems like the best solution.

- Not a single Muslim country should be allowed nuclear weapons (preferably not even nuclear energy) or even ICBM delivery systems. These countries have plenty of sunlight to run their societies on solar energy. No WMDs, no nuclear power, no ICBM delivery systems, nothing that can destroy modern carriers or stealth planes all equals: no problem.

Education

- Elementary and high schools needs to be improved drastically, certainly in the poorest neighborhoods. Having stood as an intern in front of half a dozen elementary school classes, mainly in Rotterdam immigrant neighborhoods, for about two years, one major problem I noticed time and time again is that one or two extremely dysfunctional children, no matter how many anti-depressants and tranquilizers they are given, are always steering up others (usually boys) and holding back the entire class. Often the teacher literally has to interrupt the lessons every few minutes to prevent an ADD or other dysfunctional child from starting a tantrum. And this goes on day in, day out, year round.

  The result? Many teachers are completely burned out (seen quite a few of those) and can't properly teach their material to the rest of the class. In turn this results in longer school hours with less essential courses as gym, history and geography being replaced with additional math and language sessions. Usually these kids still perform under the norm and they will never be able to go to college or university.

  In short, I found it all quite tragic to see that 5 to 10 percent is holding back the other 90 to 95 percent. And it is personal. I remember quite a few (immigrant) children who were already lagging behind, but were well-behaved, super-nice, and eager to learn. And I hardly could help them, because even the main teachers could not or hardly could control the class. So unless their parents make them switch schools, these kids are screwed for life.

  What people have to realize is that elementary school in particular is like a machine that after 6 to 8 years spits out 12-year-olds with a basic packet of knowledge. Almost each lesson of every day is planned for the whole year. At the end of third grade, children are required to have basic reading and writing skills. If they don't, which is very common among immigrant children and in disorderly classes, these kids will start lagging behind in everything. They can't quickly and properly grasp questions asked with math, history, geography, etc., nor can they write down answers quickly enough. One would think these kids would eventually catch up, but the fact is that they seldom do, certainly not without a lot of after-school practice. You want your kids to go to college? Make sure they can read and write excellently as soon

as possible.

Some ideas I can come up with while sitting here:

- Don't primarily boost teacher's salaries, although they do deserve more. Instead, make sure to drastically reduce stress teachers have, mainly in immigrant neighborhoods, by introducing better policies. Make their job fun and rewarding, not some kind of torturous hellhole.

- Curb immigration, especially from black and Muslim countries, and most problems will go away. As discussed in a separate article, in late 2014 63% of Dutch prisoners were foreign in a country where "only" 22% of the population at that point was foreign. And how about that roughly half of Muslims in the West are still in favor of strict Sharia law? We see clear trends in schools: over the line Asian, Indian and white children will cause less problems than Muslim and especially black children. Seen it with my own eyes - endlessly - and I'll never take it back.

- Each day every school child is provided with a meal that includes an orange (the most healthy and cheap fruit) and fresh vegetables. In addition, a vitamin and omega 3 pill is provided. The parents pay for this meal. This is done to ensure that all children get all the necessary nutrients, no matter what they are being given at home. It should reduce attention deficit disorders and in any case proper nutrition is something each kid should have a right to.

- Each day every school child meditates/does qigong for 5-6 minutes, again to reduce the chances of problematic behavior. Children are free to believe in what context they see the meditation: spiritual, religious, or atheist/science.

- Parents with overweight children will be required by law to consult with a nutritionist for which they pay themselves until the child has reached a normal weight again. This is basic child protection, not just physically but also to protect it emotionally in a variety of ways.

- Children who have above average results, consistently behave the best and are the most caring towards others (there a lot of those actually) are taught MMA, Krav Maga, and are also taught to protect others from bullies.

- Parents are strongly and immediately held responsible for the behavior of their children and required to do everything in their power to make sure a child is behaving at school.

- A rough idea: All children who consistently interrupt lessons (and therefore screw over their more willing classmates) will quickly be transferred to special schools with a military regimen. Teachers must exude authority under all circumstances and behave like drill sergeants, with zero tolerance for obstructive behavior. At these schools teachers are allowed to physically discipline children with rulers to their hands (as in the past) and there are plenty of areas where children can work alone. Children will be instilled with the belief that it is good to be responsible, helpful, polite, and hard-working - and even to teach their parents that. There's a lot of physical exercise. Anything with martial arts is only allowed for students that have done their best to change. Parents will pay for the additional cost of these schools and they'll pay for background checks and psychological exams for themselves and their child in order to determine what exactly is going on. Children can go back to their old school if they have improved their behavior over a longer period of time. They can be send back just as easily, however.

- Obviously children that are slow learners or truly have some kind of mental disability that cannot be fixed with nutrition, meditation, sports, counseling, or medication will have to go to an entirely different special school that has a very soft and stimulating character.

- Put cameras in all classes and hallways. In cases of a dispute about a child or teacher's behavior, just look up the video.

- I'd say, considering cameras are cheap these days that even teachers at ordinary schools in severe cases should be allowed to physically discipline their pupils in order to correct them. I've seen a lot of children, boys in particular, exploiting the fact that teacher's can't touch them, even taunting them about it. Without repercussions, of course. I've also seen a 10-year-old boy hitting and kicking a pregnant teacher in the stomach. No repercussions whatsoever. You can't solve everything by talking, certainly not when a kid is being belligerent on purpose because there are no consequences at school or at home. Then again, most

problems I've seen can be solved by curbing immigration and implementing the above guidelines.

Some might think my measures are a bit too much. The fact is, I've been one of many problematic children in school, starting from the 6th grade all the way through high school. When I look at how I treated some classmates and teachers, I'm pretty sorry about that. While sometimes fun, most of it has been a big waste of time because I wasn't doing what I should have been doing. It must be said, it can be really tough to find motivation for anything if you're working class and/or not stimulated by your parents or school to really find positive outlets that you're passionate about. Sports and the opposite sex is a pretty good start though. A lot of men grow up very quickly when becoming good at a sport or when they meet the right woman. Oh, and I always liked military discipline and it will undoubtedly attract a lot of the rougher kids.

Zero-tolerance city districts

- Governments should designate zero-tolerance districts based on crime levels. This can be a few blocks or entire city sections. People living in these districts will receive instant fines for causing any kind of public disturbance: music (especially now in the age of giant subwoofers or, alternately, in the streets and especially malls, cell phones with increasingly powerful speakers on them), undue yelling and screaming, threats to or fights with neighbors, the dumping of trash around the house or in the streets, smoking weed where it bothers other people, etc. Dogs will not be allowed in these districts. Why? Living in Western Europe, over the years I've gotten used to seeing people:

  - take dumps in the bushes, because they're not used to toilets where they come from;
  - eat while sitting in public transportation, opening the door or window to throw their take-away left-overs onto the street;
  - ignore red lights on busy streets;
  - practice their drifting skills on busy crossroads;
  - ignore green lights with 10 cars behind them waiting, because they're talking to a buddy in the street;
  - keep 100 families awake all night with garden parties, with the police too overworked and demotivated to even show up after 8+ hours of this;

- incite little brothers to throw fireworks at strangers or scare/insult them in some other way;
- keep noisy "guard dogs" in their garden year round, even in extreme cold, without looking after them the slightest, apart from throwing some food in the garden;
- disrespect or otherwise harrass random attractive women - as young as 14 years old - who go over street without male company;
- kids trying to kick in the door or threatening to kill their mother when they're told to cool off outside the house.

All this is increasingly normal in poorer neighborhoods of western Europe. Except for the occasional drunk hooligan, all examples here involve immigrants of African/Caribbean and Arab Muslim descent. But besides that, overall strict rules for low-income, poorly-educated people would be very good. They need whatever time they have to focus on raising and feeding their children properly, and seek additional education. It can be challenge in Europe's new ghettos to even do some studying in the evening. Enormous time is wasted with trying to rehabilitate or talk sense into inconsiderate or criminal elements in poorer neighborhoods. It doesn't work. No debates should take place with the police, because it's a job that already generates enough stress. Hit these people in their wallet, hard. If someone doesn't behave, he or she will soon end up on the street or get send back to their country of origin. Want to give a party? Need to make noise for some reason? Establish a line of communication with your neighbors first.

Initally I was thinking designating low income neighborhoods as zero-tolerance would do the trick, but, as usual, reality is far less politically correct: as statistics in this article show, immigrant and especially U.S. black ghettos on average have about 2 to 7 times the amount of crime. Poor white (and especially Asian) neighborhoods do not necessarily have exceptionally high crime numbers. So while rules might be a little stricter in poor neighborhoods in general, crime levels should really dictate local law.

- At least for the Netherlands, *more* police "violence" in designated zero-tolerance districts, mainly soccer stadiums and the big cities. When I look at all the abuse police officers have to endure from hooligans and certain groups of the immigrant population, I have no problem with them using batons and really beat the crap out of people who are taunting them. The use of batons is extremely restricted, however, so just like teachers, police officers often get

abused when they don't deserve it. In my opinion, we're supposed to be a little afraid of the police when we're doing something that is not correct. Of course, I do expect that protest groups or otherwise any kind of polite lawbreakers and critics are treated with respect. I also don't have any problem with tasers, but only against people who are really being aggressive - or in case a man in resisting arrest by female police officers. Tasers become an extreme menace though in a society where the police has become oppressive. It's a dangerous weapon. Certainly any police officer armed with a taser should undergo being tasered during training. And statistics and reports should be kept on the amount of times a police officer tasers someone and for what reason.

- Do MUCH more about neighborhood noise nuisance. It's becoming a HUGE, GIANT problem in western countries since Third World immigration has exploded. Many blacks have voices like gorillas and baboons (literally, no exaggaration) that blast straight through the walls of houses or can be heard 200 yards/meters to either side if they are talking on their phone in the garden or on their balcony (just as loud at 3 AM at night as during the day). In general, the levels of anti-social behavior among Third World immigrants is orders of magnitude higher than among native whites (apart from students). In recent years it has even become fashionable, especially among black youths, followed by Arabs youths, to blast music on phone speakers while walking on the street or in the mall, or on the bicycle. We used to have headphones for that, but they are being used less and less by immigrants in particular.

  Overworked as they are due to immigration, the police is not doing much about it in many western countries. They give these complaints incredibly low priority and hardly show up, work with "yellow cards", engage in tons "debate" that never works before they might finally give a mild fine or take away the equipment.

  What we need is very basic legislation: if music or screaming is audible outside the home, instant fine. You're not supposed to hear that, no matter what type of music or screaming. If you want to turn up the music, better ask all neighbors for permission first. That can be anything from 40 euros/dollars if it's very mild and the first time to several thousand euros/dollars if it involves garden parties with speakers in the garden and it has happened several times. The cities need to become a place of peace again.

  In the Netherlands, only a limited number of studies are available

on this problem:

- Way back in 2001 a *Milieu en Gezondheid* (*Milieu and Health*) report of the Dutch government-linked TNO group reported that *"noise disturbances annually cause 80,000 cases of heigtened blood pressure and 4,000 cases of heart attacks and angina pectoris [chest pains]."*
- In 2008 *"a study of the Home Ownership Association [Vereniging Eigen Huis] revealed that three-quarters of home owners would consider a move due to a-social neighbors. One in five home owners has moved at one point due noisy neighbors."* Rebelling teenagers, barking dogs and noise children all were considered major reasons for a move. [7]
- In July 2019 Scanmover.com/nl/ published a poll among 1050 people, revealing that *"More than a quarter [25%+] of the inhabitants of North-Holland [includes Amsterdam], Flevoland and Limburg" has moved at one point due to noisy neighbors."*[8] [8]
- Over a 7 year period from 2012 to 2018 only 15,000 noise nuisance fines - 2,143 per year - were handed out in the whole of the Netherlands (17 million inhabitants). Compare this to 58,000 complaints over the first half of 2018 alone and we can see that only in 1.8% of cases a fine is handed out. [9] [9]

From my own neighborhood I know that the vast majority of people don't even bother reporting noise nuisance anymore (easily a million+), no matter how extreme, because the police has no capacity to show up. And when they do, they generally don't consider it loud enough to fine, and start having these "friendly neighborly chats" with the most a-social people imaginable. Even when they have to come by every week, putting a huge unpaid burden on their limited capacity, they just keep talking, talking, talking - unless maybe they catch an easy 100 dB coming from a home at 4:30 a.m. at night. This policy is really disturbing. It is not even uncommon for police officers to turn on the persons that called them: *"Ah, it's just a birthday party, right?"* Even when it's always the same handful of households who have extremely loud parties.

We have similar information from Great Britain:

- In 2014 the BBC reported that on average 27% of British experienced noise problems with a neighbor in the PAST YEAR, with Populous polling bureau executive director Richard Lloyd concluding *"that young people especially are suffering in silence"* (one assumes because they live in poorer neighborhoods versus a better neighborhood, elderly homes

and poorer hearing): *"Among 18 to 24-year-olds, 33% had encountered a [neigborly noise] problem in the past year, with the figure being 17% for those aged 65 and over."* Noise primarily came from loud voices and arguing, followed by music and televisions, and finally, slamming doors. [10][10]

- Another British report, released in the summer of 2016, paints an even worse picture:

> *"Two thirds of UK homeowners [67%] say their lives are being blighted by the actions of those next door, new research reveals. Experts say rows are increasing each year, with rising house prices possibly to blame as more people live in cramped spaces.*
>
> *"Late night parties and loud music are one of the most common bugbear... Noise regularly caused anxiety for more than a third, with early morning lawn mowing, loud TV and phone calls, revving motorbikes or loud music causing a nuisance. ... Boisterous children, noisy pets, boundary disputes and overgrown gardens are also top reasons neighbours are driving people mad. ...*
>
> *"Some disputes are so bad that one in ten say they have physically fought with their neighbour. Nearly one in five have called the police and contacted the council, with more than a third saying they are considering moving because of the stress. More than one in four say their happiness has been significantly reduced, with a fourth saying they suffer "serious" stress over their neighbours.*
>
> *"Nearly one in five said they don't know their neighbours, with 20 per cent not knowing their name and half unaware of what they do for a living."* [11]

It's a crime of governments internationally not to do MUCH more about stopping this issue that is affecting well over 100 million people in the West - and more every year due to Third World immigration. In that sense it certainly is very interesting that I have never seen this issue being part of any election campaign.

Dog-ownership

- Phase out the sale of all dogs that cause a disproportiate amount of attacks on children, adults and other dogs. Whether or not

these dogs can theoretically be properly trained is not important - statistics are. Even tigers can be trained to be social, but legalization will most likely result in massive casualties. Are we going to blame the owners in that case also? Anyway, some statistics can be found below:

Table 1—Breeds of dogs involved in human dog bite-related fatalities (DBRF) in the United States, by 2-year period, between 1979 and 1998.

Breed	Total
Purebred	
Pit bull-type	66
Rottweiler	39
German Shepherd Dog	17
Husky-type	15
Malamute	12
Doberman Pinscher	9
Chow Chow	8
Great Dane	7
Saint Bernard	7
Crossbred	
Wolf-dog hybrid	14
Mixed-breed	12
German Shepherd Dog	10†
Pit bull-type	10†
Husky-type	6
Rottweiler	5†
Alaskan Malamute	3
Chow Chow	3
Doberman Pinscher	0
Saint Bernard	1
Great Dane	0†
No. deaths for which breed was known	238

*Numbers differ from previous reports because police/guard dogs "at work" were
and a crossbred dog of this breed were involved in a single fatality; therefore, that b

JAVMA, Vol 217, No. 6, September 15, 2000

Deaths from dog attacks, of course, only consitute the tiniest fraction of permanent maimings, severe damage, minor damage, and dog casualties and woundings - the latter a specialty of Pit Bulls. Another MAJOR problem with Pit Bulls is that in contrast with most other breeds, 95% of their attacks are completely unprovoked and without warning signs being given off.

While I think it's a little odd that anno 2016 no clear-cut statistics are available on dog attacks per breed set off against the percentage in circulation, statistics certainly do reveal a disproportiate amount of damaging attacks from Pit Bulls. Based on the paper you can read when clicking **HERE**, I made the following oversight. The data is not perfect, because it only involves media-reported attacks in which the dog breed is clearly identified - with the percentages of the dog population based on animal shelters. The percentage numbers in red give an indication how dangerous a dog is in relation to a Pit Bull. Despite not being a perfect oversight, it does give some indication as to which (well-known) dogs need to be phased out, or only be available to people

with special licences.

SEVERE DOG ATTACKS PER BREED, U.S. AND CANADA, SEP. 1982-DEC. 31, 2014
Requiring extensive hospitalization

Breed	● Relative to Pit Bull based on % of dogs	Attacks doing bodily harm	Child victims	Adult victims	Deaths	Maimings	%/dogs
Chow	1200%	61	37	18	8	40	.01%
Bull mastiff (Presa Canario)	1100%	111	46	41	18	63	.02%
Blue heeler	1000%	20	2	3	0	5	<.01%
Akita	197%	70	44	22	8	52	.07%
Pit bull	100%	3397	1355	1312	295	2110	6.69%
Cane Corso/Italian mastiff	83%	21	4	11	2	12	.05%
Bulldog (English)	66%	20	12	4	1	14	.06%
Rottweiler	38%	535	297	141	85	296	2.76%
Malamute	37%	15	12	2	6	5	.08%
Belgian shepherd (Malinois)	35%	7	4	3	0	4	.04%
Saint Bernard	24%	12	8	1	1	7	.10%
Husky	16%	83	51	8	26	27	1.04%
Boxer	10%	64	19	23	7	31	1.25%
Great Dane	6.5%	37	12	9	3	19	1.08%
German shepherd	6%	113	65	41	15	73	3.72%
Labrador	4.5%	56	37	17	3	45	2.47%
Doberman	2.7%	23	12	9	8	12	1.70%
Labrador mix	0.7%	27	18	7	1	23	8.98%
Golden retriever	0.7%	11	9	2	3	7	3.08%
Jack Russell terrier	0.6%	5	3	1	2	2	1.46%
Poodle	0.3%	4	2	1	0	1	2.55%
Dachschund	0.25%	6	3	3	1	6	4.68%
Pomeranian	0.15%	1	1	0	1	0	1.33%
Chihuahua	0.07%	1	1	0	1	1	2.75%

ISGP.nl compilation — TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF DOGS: 46%

CLICK to enlarge.

The internet is filled with anecdotal stories on dangerous Chihuahuas and Labradors (many of them by Pit Bull owners), but take a look at these numbers. Pit Bulls clearly need to be phased out, simple as that. They were bred to be fearless (that's why there's virtually no difference between attacks on children or adults, despite its small size), kill other dogs and never give up during a fight. We don't need dogs like that around. There's a reason why most Pit Bulls are owned by marginal figures of society - the ghettos in particular are filled with them.

A problem, of course, is that many dog breeds contain Pit Bulls genes, but ultimately one simply bans all breeds and cross-breeds which show exceptionally high aggression numbers.

Looking deeper at the data, it appears that just phasing out Pit Bulls (and Rottweilers) is not going to do the trick. People looking for powerful dogs are going to switch to other breeds that at this point all constitute less than 0.1-0.5% of the dog population. The Tosu Inu, Presa Canario, Dogo Argentino, Fila Brasileiro and a number of other dogs come to mind. While they are more expensive to maintain due to their size, they almost certainly will cause even greater problems if they are around in the same numbers as Pit Bulls are today.

Tosu Inu, Presa Canario, Dogo Argentino and Fila Brasileiro: four relatively rare dogs that easily could cause even more trouble if Pit Bulls are ever phased out.

Believe it or not, I'm a first-class dog lover. Personally I prefer German Shepherds, but that's not an absolute and to each his or her own. My main concern is not even people, but other dogs. Grandma's Chihuahua, your girlfriend's Jack Russell Terrier, and the family's Golden Retriever are not safe in a park with Pit Bulls. I can speak from experience here. Within a year of my parents getting a dog, it was attacked and nearly killed - completely unprovoked - by two Pit Bulls. When my father tried to rescue the dog, he was also attacked. If my mother would have been walking the dog, or the owner of the Pit Bulls wouldn't have been nearby, the situation could have been much worse. It's not exactly the only story that I've heard. This attack, by the way, despite considerable injury, was resolved privately and never reported to the authorities - as undoubtedly many attacks are.

To be honest, I really prefer that anyone can own all the above-mentioned dogs, but that a lot of these breeds don't exceed 0.1-0.2% of all dogs, that there's a waiting list when it exceeds this number, and that they are only provided to very respectable citizens who know exactly what they're doing. But for now, phase out the Pit Bulls until they constitute less than 0.1-0.2% of the entire dog population - then we'll talk details.

Update: One month after finishing this text, the family dog (a female German Shepherd) was attacked again by two dogs. Their disfunctional owners, who were already creating endless problems for their neighbors it turns out, just opened the door and let the dogs run into the park all by themselves. Here they happen to encounter our family dog and instantly attack, leaving several deep bite marks. Type of dog? A Pitbull-Bull Dog crossbreed.

So, once again I find my "prejudices" against Pit Bulls and their average owners confirmed.

- Abolish dog-ownership in the poorest and most criminal neighborhoods of large cities. A lot of people here have a tendency to dump dogs in their garden where they bark all day (and sometimes even all night without consequences), have no clue how to train their dogs, no money to take care of them when they are old, sick and/or injured; sometimes no money to even properly feed them, and often live in poorly-insulated houses. When you live here, take a canary, hamster, rabbit, ot something along those lines.

For all the rest: centralized control over the distribution of pets to counter abuse, stress from barking dogs, and the ever increasing amount of abandoned animals. People who want a dog, a cat, a rabbit or other animal, will need to contact a special government-ran agency, which:

- tags the animals with microchips;
- does financial and criminal background checks;
- will first introduce the family to older animals that need a new home the most (and which are many times cheaper than young animals);
- has the applicant do an exam about the animal in question on how to take care and train it;
- will not give licenses to anyone if there is a chance that the animal will be mistreated, abandoned, or cause noise disturbance.
- will take the animal away if there are signs of neglect, abuse or noise disturbance.

- Ban the sale of new dogs (or cats) when animal shelters reach a too-be-determined number.

Gun laws: E.U. and U.S.

- Gun violence is a hugely controversial topic in the United States, so let's first take a look at some relevant statistics. According to the Center for Disease Control, in 2013 there were 11,208 firearm homicides in the U.S. Compare this to an average U.K. firearm homicide rate in recent years of 45 (37 in 2012), according the Office for National Statistics. The U.S. has 5 times the inhabitants of the U.K. 11,200 : 45 = 250 : 5 = 50 times more. That's a pretty huge difference and can be observed in the statistics below of the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime and the OECD:





Compared to the Third World, the United States does very well when it comes to gun violence, but compared to Europe and other English-speaking countries, the United States is quite a disaster. And these are just the homicide numbers. They don't even include suicides and accidental firearm deaths, which add another 40% to the total. Then the picture looks like this (rates can vary significantly per decade or even year):



Let's look a little deeper at these statistics. In 2013 the total number of homicides in the U.S. was 16,121, so 11,208 : 16,121 gives us a 70% murder rate by firearm. Now, looking at the U.K., we have an average in recent years of about 550 homicides. Divide this by the earlier-mentioned 45 gun homicides and we have an 8% murder rate with guns. That means the U.K. only has 17%, or let's say 1/5, the homicide rate of the U.S. My seemingly obvious interpretation of this data is that guns make it many times easier to kill someone.

Does this mean we should ban all guns in the United States? Well, before doing that, the U.S., and maybe the West as a whole, should first firmly acknowledge that immigrants and especially blacks in the United States generate the vast majority of crime. This includes a murder rate that is 8 times higher than whites. Hispanics, which are partly white, murder roughly 2 to 2.5 times more often than whites. Asians, on the other hand, do four times better with this than whites. Ultimately the first step towards any new gun legislation is a solid acknowledgement of these facts.



Because this is unlikely to happen, we should still be able to bring down the amount of deaths by upping the minimum age for gun owenership, mandatory training, mandatory membership of a local shooting club (for practice and to demonstrate you still know what you're doing, but also as a social control structure, so antisocial, obnoxious trailer trash will instantly get banned - and with that their license to own guns), regular check ups if guns are stored properly at home, and banning everyone with a history of psychological issues, including any person who orders anti-depressants. Whoever visits a psychologist or orders an anti-depressant, should be registered and their gun license revoked for as long as they are on it. Simple as that.

Usually people think that guns are completely banned in Europe. This is not true. You can often obtain a license in the way spelled out above. In the Netherlands anyone who passes a background

check and joins a shooting club can buy a handgun. After 3 years the individual can buy any rifle except for .50 cals, which are banned in general. Hence, a .308 sniper rifle that can hit a target at a mile distance is perfectly legal at that point. You can walk into the store and buy them. With the right permits and at-home checks if the guns are stored safely, hunting is legal too.

The Netherlands, where this author hails from, furthermore is unique because it still doesn't have any limits on the power of airweapons, likely because:

A) nobody has a clue just how powerful they have become in the 2020s;
B) it's relatively expensive and cumbersome;
C) airweapons luckily are generally too large and "gay" for crime groups;
D) illegal firearms are relatively easy to acquire.

However, I have a Chinese .308 air rifle for less than 400 euros that has 80-130% the power of a subsonic, 1,070fps, 40 grain .22 Long Rifle bullet. With a (legal) silencer it produces about 100dB, which is infinitely more acceptable than a forcibly unsilenced 9mm handgun in the United States (160dB) - or about 130dB silenced. Especially with a home-made spitzer slug (45gr) and low wind, it can hit with near pinpoint accuracy at 117m/130y, roughly the outer limit of subsonic ammunition in terms of acceptable drop for small targets. Even at this distance the slug will smash through bone the thickness of a human skull, and will still do so at 200m/220y when tuned to the max with a 66gr (home-made) spitzer slug. Of course, investing in a scuba tank an/or compressor will cost hundreds more euros. No firearm? No limits. Not in the Netherlands. As air rifles become even more powerful and knowledge of this spreads, there's no doubt it will be banned though.

Most likely one of the few areas of improvement in the Netherlands is to do more extensive psychological background checks and banning anyone with a history of serious psychological treatment. Also anyone on anti-depressants should hand over his or her guns, because it's very common for them to actually cause bouts of emotional instability. Most public shooters in the U.S. actually were on over-the-counter anti-depressants, so the use of this type of medicine needs to be tightly registered. Finally, ban heavy crime groups: blacks, Arabs, Latinos. It seems that that alone will solve most of the problem.

> The Dutch model should work just fine in the United States, with maybe a few minor additions. What would change in U.S. states with strong hunting traditions? Nothing really. One can still have the guns; just tighter controls will be in place and every single person will be educated about its use. Also, somehow I don't mind that so many Americans are in the possession of assault rifles and heavy-powered sniper rifles, at least in the more remote regions, away from the big cities and crime-ridden ghettos. It's a tradition that maybe should be cherished (certainly it keeps movies more interesting), but not expanded to other countries. I'd fight to keep guns banned here if it means easy access to all immigrant groups, but at the same time I would campaign to keep guns around in the proper regions of the United States. It really depends on population density, ethnic backgrounds and immigration, the level of culture and education, and the effectiveness of the police forces if guns can be allowed somewhere. I got deeper into it with my Chinese .308 and I love rifle and hunting culture.
>
> As for protecting oneself from the government, there's one thing that gun owners should realize: guns only offer very limited protection from a modern government. First of all, any aspiring fascist government would find pretexts to have the guns taken away. As simple as promoting the use of anti-depressants might do the trick: a few more school shootings in a row and the guns may go all by themselves. Alternately, the aspiring fascist government itself can orchestrate a few mass shootings in a row, Gang of Nijvel-style or loner-related. Poof! Guns are gone. It's really quite easy, because the media is already owned and large scale psychological warfare has made it impossible for anyone to bring up conspiracy theories.
>
> What is also important to keep in mind is that guns will not protect the masses from an advanced army that most likely will target the wives, children, family and friends of dissidents, or simply kill an entire neighborhood where an act of resistance has taken place. The Nazis did it, Stalin did it, Putin wouldn't be above it we know since Ukraine, and the CIA and Pentagon have all the knowledge and experience to do it ten times as effective. Also, dictatorships are often born as a result of a major economic downturn in which too many people will simply be too poor and weakened to put up any serious resistance.
>
> The fact is, using guns to prevent tyrannical government is like having been irresponsible with your health all your life, finding out at the last moment that you have terminal end-stage cancer at

age 52, but still trying to save yourself with chemotherapy. Maybe, just maybe, you'll overcome it, but in all circumstances your recovery is going to be a devastating experience with the odds greatly stacked against you. Obviously it's much better to detect the cancer at a very early stage or even prevent it altogether with a healthy lifestyle.

The real ingredients for preventing tyranny is a large amount of citizens having knowledge on how society is being manipulated by the superclass and the security services at every level: false flag operations and control over the mainstream media as well as the alternative media. Ultimately that requires enough people getting themselves *really* educated, and then writing, spreading knowledge in the streets, becoming truly independent activists, and refusing to back down even in the face of extreme ridicule. This, of course, is a lot less fun than waving the flag, drinking beer, and emptying your AR-15 at the local shooting range with your buddies. But this is precisely what is necessary: knowledge and awareness, not guns.

That having been said, as long as the population has access to large numbers of firearms, especially sniper and assault rifles, and a anti-government militia-type tradition, any government would likely have to spent several years or decades at least to find pretexes to confiscate all the guns. So in that sense, gun culture automatically protects from tyranny, to a degree. Also very important is that with heavy weapons an individual, or a small group, can make a major statement. The problem there, of course, is though, of the other 80% of the population is asleep, the government and media will spin any "freedom" attack into a "terrorist" attack. Arguably, almost always acts of violence will result in the achieving the opposite of the intended effect, at least as long as the same group doesn't control the media.

To summarize: Guns are for killing living things, preferably animals that will be eaten. Guns can be used to have a good time. They can help prevent an occupation by a foreign country. However, it's very questionable if they will stop a modern government. One has to become more intellectually sophisticated to prevent that. And statistically speaking, using guns for personal protection does not make for safer streets. It does the exact opposite. But life is not all about statistics and who am I to step on tradition and having a little fun? So as long as we kill cows for meat and there's enough game to hunt, guns should not be made all-out illegal. And if western governments force veganism on us, we should poach 10x harder.

Finally, the idea that one man can make a big statement by having guns around always is a card to have up your sleeve. But as ISGP's "conservative CIA" oversight partially makes clear, has there even been a case of genuine, mindful, freedom-inspired terrorism in the United States? Every person who has engaged in terrorism seems to have been either a total lunanic or have peculiar "alt right" / "conservative CIA" ties, often of the Nazi kind. All these legal sniper rifles and "patriots" in the United States, indoctrinated for decades about "the CFR", "the Rockefellers" and "George Soros" and... never an act a resistance. All steroid-fueled, tattood-up sheep desperate for a little status and pussy.

And finally, finally, lead is absolutely terrible to shoot with. It is a highly toxic metal that poisons nature and animals. One example would be hawks dying from animals having been shot with lead ammo. Non-lead ammunition, from steel penetrators to other, softer metals are very much desirable.

Prostitution

Potentially 100 times more effective than any psychologist and 100 times more fun than any comedian. Probably deserves to make more than any doctor because of it.

Legalization and regulation of prostitution, as is the state of affairs in the Netherlands. If prostitution is illegal, the mafia and other criminal groups will get involved in the business, meaning long hours, slave wages, beatings, forced addiction with payments in heroin, human trafficking and sketchy customers.

Legalization is just way better. Private houses / brothels always are very low profile, so you don't even notice they're there. I have several in my neighborhood here and didn't even know before taking an interest in the business. Also, in Rotterdam at least we don't have these seedy prostitution districts around anymore filled with criminals and heroin-addicted prostitutes strolling around the streets (methadone programs / drug legalization programs also helped a lot there).

In my opinion, prostitution doesn't have to be negative at all,

> despite the fact that it largely attracts people of questionable moral character due to the taboo that rests on the subject and the fact that these people have a harder time finding partners. Some kids are simply too nervous about sex. Others wish what it feels like to sleep with an exceptionally beautiful girl. Others are a little rusty when not having dated a long time. Some like a good time with friends. Or somebody is simply lonely.
>
> Do I think there should be additional regulation of the sector even in a country as the Netherlands? Absolutely. There's a brothel / private house 150 meters from my house. Recently I saw the creepiest 65-year-old guy or so walk out of there. He sent chills up my spine. A little obese, white as a vampire, tiny little sunglasses on, dirty brown leather jacket. He looked like a combination of a pedophile and a cocaine dealer. Disgusting in every way. Good chance he got kicked out, but let's come up with a few additional ideas on regulation that I can think of at the top of my head:
>
> - People convicted of murder (not counting self-protection), sexual abuse, or other major crimes should get an automatic life-long ban on visiting private houses. Pedophiles (not the 27-year-old who sleeps with his 17-year-old fellow college student - although that shouldn't necessarily be legal) should be microchipped for life and not allowed anywhere near private houses either.
> - Have prostitutes take a national language exam. Don't speak the native language properly? Then no license, because they don't have enough of a therapeutic value. On top of that, it will only lead to tons of unhealthy and depressing Second or Third World imports.
> - Prostitutes can discriminate: they're allowed to refuse customers beforehand based on race (which happens a lot and for very good reason).
> - Prostitutes cannot be forced by contract into a certain amount of working hours. It might not help in character building, but there's a good reason why this is the norm. They can come and go whenever they please.
> - Like is normal in a night club, totally judge whether or not a customer is allowed any of the girls. It's somewhat *not done* to judge a customer on things he cannot help, but there absolutely should be national standards on:
>   - muscle-fat ratio (not just fat percentage);
>   - skin color (as in: send some people to the tanning studio);
>   - health / demeanor;
>   - strict codes of conduct;

- and established price variations on all these issues

for people visiting private houses. To a large part private house should help in preparing people towards ordinary, stable relationships, whether these are open or not. You don't want to create an army of lazy "drug addicts".

- It might create a little bit of a black market, but maybe ban 45-year-olds and higher from ordinary private houses where you hardly find any girls above 30, with 24 or so probably being the average age. This allows for more tightly regulated private houses for older women to be set up. Women with a good figure will always be attractive and older guys should get used to that. Can't be on the dance floor anymore with the teenagers. Messes up the vibe.
- What's hilarious is that private houses in the Netherlands actually all seem to charge flat rates of about 80 euros per half hour or so. That's so weird. No wonder most girls aren't that pretty, with half being imported from the East Bloc with no prospects whatsoever. Dump the political correctness, dump the the communism, and start discriminating. A gorgious 21-year-old Nikki who works hard for her figure, tries to pay for a college education and actually speaks the native language, shouldn't cost the same as... let's just say someone who isn't as pretty, tight, ambitious and fluent in the language. If I were to become a Gigolo tomorrow (hmmm... I'd sleep with slightly crazy overweight middle-aged women all day for 40-50 euros per hour ;), I'd never accept a communist-style "we're all equal" system like that. I'd work indepedently, but for girls this - to me at least - seems to be way too dangerous. All you do is create a market in which really attractive girls are so scarce that they can charge exhorbitant amounts of money that basically amounts to stealing. That's great for Charlie Sheen and the oligarchs, but maybe not best for society as a whole.
- Experiment with very low or even no taxes for prostitutes. It seems to me it's a dirty, hard business, but also very necessary. So at the very least make sure prostitutes can become financially independent in the shortest time possible: they can get out of debt, get their education, and move on while at the same time having fulfilled an important necessary function in society.

Any other opinions? Not really. Basically, the less taboo rests on the subject, the more light we shine on the business, the more prostitutes will be able to set rules, the less men feel they need to disrespect these women, and the better demand and supply will

> be. Sex is pretty much one of the most innocent and positive things a person can be engaged in. It's just one person intimitely and hopefully lovingly connecting with another. Let's not make a big deal out of it because we're terribly insecure. What are we? Muslims? If Muslims or any other religious fanatic opposes it, we should probably implement it.

Notes

1. Feb. 21, 2012, Forbes magazine, 'Billionaire Sheldon Adelson Says He Might Give $100M to Newt Gingrich or Other Republican'.
2. See ISGP's "Liberal CIA" article/oversight for relevant sources on liberal establishment backing of the Occupy Wall Street movement.
3. Rockefeller, Soros, and Bronfman money or direct involvement can be spotted in the psychedelics community. Terence and Dennis McKenna, the Heffter Research Institute, the Multidisciplinary Association for Psychedelic Studies (MAPS), the Drug Alliance Policy, and Amber Lyon and her Reset.me website all have clear, demonstratable ties to these elites - and others as well. See ISGP's "Liberal CIA" article/oversight for relevant sources.
4. See ISGP's "Liberal CIA" article/oversight for relevant sources on liberal establishment backing of the Black Lives Matter movement.
5. *) March 31, 2004, Pravda, 'Soros preparing revolution in Ukraine': *"Famous financier and philanthropist George Soros was poured with glue and water at the conference "Human Rights at Elections" in Kiev. Two young people came into the conference room and poured panel members (including George Soros) with glue and water. They were shouting. "Long live the "Brotherhood!"" (Ukrainian nationalistic movement) and "Soros, leave Ukraine, your plans will fail!" Earlier, one of the young men tried to engage the conference participants in fights. Policemen drove the two men out of the conference room. The incident postponed the beginning of the conference by 15 minutes. "This is not just an accident, somebody planned this," said George Soros. However, he failed to name the incident organizers. ... After NATO expansion Ukraine became the border state where the interests of Russia and the West are confronting. In thsi respect the presidential elections in October 2004 are very important. There are two leading candidates to become successors of President Kuchma - Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovich and the leader of "Our Ukraine" movement Vladimir Yushenko supported by the West. US politicians from the Democratic Party are paying special attention to Ukraine. A month*

ago former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visited Kiev. On March 29 George Soros arrived in Ukraine. ... [Soros'] attitude to the current administration is so bad that he is ready to spend any money to overthrow President Bush. While waiting for his chance, the oligarch is training on smaller countries."

*) November 26, 2004, The Guardian, 'US campaign behind the turmoil in Kiev': *"With their websites and stickers, their pranks and slogans aimed at banishing widespread fear of a corrput regime, the democracy guerrillas of the Ukrainian Pora youth movement have already notched up a famous victory - whatever the outcome of the dangerous stand-off in Kiev. Ukraine, traditionally passive in its politics, has been mobilised by the young democracy activists and will never be the same again. But while the gains of the orange-bedecked "chestnut revolution" are Ukraine's, the campaign is an American creation, a sophisticated and brilliantly conceived exercise in western branding and mass marketing that, in four countries in four years, has been used to try and salvage rigged elections and topple unsavoury regimes. Funded and organised by the US government, deploying consultancies, pollsters, diplomats, the two big American parties and US non-government organisations, the campaign was first used in Europe in Belgrade in 2000 to beat Slobodan Milosevic at the ballot box. Richard Miles, the US ambassador in Belgrade, played a key role. And by last year, as US ambassador to Tbilisi, he repeated the trick in Georgia, coaching Mikhail Saakashvili in how to bring down Eduard Shevardnadze. Ten months after the success in Belgrade, the US ambassador in Minsk, Michael Kozak, a veteran of similar operations in central America, notably in Nicaragua, organised a near identical campaign to try to defeat the Belarus hardman, Alexander Lukashenko. That one failed. "There will be no Kostunica in Belarus," the Belarus president declared, referring to the victory in Belgrade. But experience gained in Serbia, Georgia and Belarus has been invaluable in plotting to beat the regime of Leonid Kuchma in Kiev. The operation - engineering democracy through the ballot box and civil disobedience - is now so slick that the methods have matured into a template for winning other people's elections. Stickers, spray paint and websites are the young activists' weapons. Irony and street comedy mocking the regime have been hugely successful in puncturing public fear and enraging the powerful. Last year, before becoming president in Georgia, the US-educated Mr Saakashvili travelled from Tbilisi to Belgrade to be coached in the techniques of mass defiance. In Belarus, the US embassy organised the dispatch of young opposition leaders to the Baltic, where they met up with Serbs travelling from Belgrade. In Serbia's case, given the hostile environment in Belgrade, the Americans organised the overthrow*

from neighbouring Hungary - Budapest and Szeged. In recent weeks, several Serbs travelled to the Ukraine. Indeed, one of the leaders from Belgrade, Alexandar Maric, was turned away at the border. The Democratic party's National Democratic Institute [an NGO headed by Madeleine Albright], the Republican party's International Republican Institute [an NGO], the US state department and USAid are the main agencies involved in these grassroots campaigns as well as Freedom House NGO [once headed by former CIA director James Woolsey and with Zbigniew Brzezinski on the board] and billionaire George Soros's Open Society Institute. US pollsters and professional consultants are hired to organise focus groups and use psephological data to plot strategy."

*) EXTRA: March 8, 2011, Reuters, 'Soros, Albright invest $250 million in APR Energy': *"A fund affiliated with hedge fund billionaire George Soros and one linked to former U.S. secretary of state Madeleine Albright [head of the National Democratic Institute] are buying a controlling stake in APR Energy, a company that mainly supplies temporary power in developing countries, for $250 million. APR Energy, which dominates the market for international temporary power generation services along with larger listed rival Aggreko Plc (AGGK.L), said it will use the investment from Soros' Quantum Strategic Partners and Albright Capital Management LLC to expand its fleet of power generators. ... Soros is a new investor in the company, while Albright's fund was already an investor. ... A growth in power demand continues to outstrip economic growth in developing countries... Based in Jacksonville, Florida, APR has existing or new power service contracts in Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica and Haita, among others."*

*) EXTRA: September 16, 2005, ukrinform.ua, 'President Viktor Yushchenko participates in festivities on occasion of founding public organiztion "Orange Circle" in New York': *"President Viktor Yushchenko, on a working visit to the USA participated in a solemn reception at the Rockefeller Center in New York on the occasion of founding the public organization Orange Circle. In his speech Viktor Yushchenko greeted founders of the organization and representatives of the Ukrainian Diaspora. ... Addressing honorary guests, in particularly, Zbigniew Brzezinski [advisory board] and Madeleine Albright, Viktor Yushchenko thanked them for support of Ukraine's democratic drive. "On behalf of free and independent Ukraine I express gratitude to its friends", the President said, The Orange Circle is a non-governmental initiative, which is aimed at assisting Ukraine in integrating to the democratic community, basing on values and principles of the "orange revolution". The overwhelming majority of the organization's sponsors are natives of Ukraine."*

*) EXTRA: November 26, 2014, The Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst,

'Soros Visits Bishkek': *"On November 17, the American business magnate and philanthropist George Soros paid two days visit to Kyrgyzstan. Soros is Chairman of the Open Society Foundation, a global network of institutes aiming to shape public policy... "*

*) EXTRA: July 8, 2015, CNBC, 'Russia may ban Soros charity in NGO crackdown': *"Hedge fund billionaire George Soros's charitable foundation may be kicked out of Russia, as Moscow considers banning foreign non-governmental organizations (NGO) that promote democracy."*

6. Jul. 15, 2022, Omroep PowNed, 'Lachgas-terreur maakt ondernemers woedend'. youtube.com/watch?v=4ao_3G8mmXs (accessed: June 27, 2023; 2:10. Second witness doesn't deny: *"I'm a foreigner myself too, but I stick to the rules."*)
7. October 6, 2008, Nu.nl, 'Nederlanders verhuizen om buren'.
8. Low-profile, except for a mention at Q-Music radio station:

   *) July 16, 2019, Metronieuws.nl, 'Burenruzies serieus probleem, 1 op de 5 verhuist'.

   *) July 16, 2019, persberichten.deperslijst.com, 'Een op vijf Nederlanders verhuist door vervelende buren'.

   *) July 16, 2019, libelle.nl, 'Zoveel mensen verhuizen omdat ze vervelende buren hebben'.
9. November 22, 2019, Eindhoven's Dagblad, 'Herrieboetes: hoeveel werden er in jouw gemeente uitgedeeld?'.

   *) November 22, 2019, Hartvannederland.nl, 'Luidruchtige buren of herrieschoppende hangjongeren: we klagen veel, maar er wordt weinig bekeurd'.
10. July 27, 2016, Express.co.uk, 'Nuisance neighbours are plaguing the lives of MILLIONS of Brits; MILLIONS of Britons are living next door to a nuisance neighbour.'